DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 063 SP 006 297

AUTHOR Altman, Burton E.
TITLE Operation Cite: (Cooperative Investment in Teacher Education.)
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Univ., La Crosse.
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Descriptions; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Activities; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Distinguished Achievement Award Entry

ABSTRACT

Operation CITE (Cooperative Investment in Teacher Education) provided student teachers with a closer and more informal type of supervision, while at the same time furnishing their critic teachers with consultant services to deal with their unique instructional and curricular problems. A classroom teacher was designated by the school administration and the university staff as a clinical professor responsible for the student teachers in his building. A university professor was assigned to the building as a consultant. Orientation meetings were planned for the classroom teachers. Throughout the year a series of assessments were effected by the leadership team to analyze and remedy problems associated with the operation. These assessments became the basis for the strategies which were used for the development of a series of in-service meetings. The program has not been in operation long enough to be evaluated; however, there does seem to be an indication of strong support among the teachers and student teachers. (Appendixes A & B include related program material.) (Author/MJM)

ED 074063

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# ABSTRACT

Title: OPERATION CITE: (COOPERATIVE INVESTMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION)

Field of Focus: Pre-service and In-service Field Experience in Planning for Instruction

Director: Dr. Burton E. Altman
Professor of Education
Department of Elementary Education
Wisconsin State University
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

Office phone: 785-1800, Ext. 256 (Area Code 608)
Home phone: 788-0424 (Area Code 608)

SP 006 911

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ABSTRACT

OPERATION CITE
(COOPERATIVE INVESTMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION)

Objective

The principal aim of Operation CITE (Cooperative Investment in Teacher Education) was to enrich the current practices employed in the supervision of student teachers in the elementary school by providing them with a closer and more informal type of supervision, while at the same time furnishing their critic teachers with consultant services in dealing with their unique instructional and curriculum problems.

Procedure

A classroom teacher was designated by the school administration and the university staff as a clinical professor and made responsible for supervision of the student teachers in his building. To assist the clinical professor, a university professor was assigned to the building as a consultant. By means of a series of orientation meetings the classroom teachers were oriented to the plan. These meetings had two purposes: (1) to delineate the roles of the leadership team consisting of the clinical professor, the university consultant, and the building principal; and (2) to describe the plan for training the student teachers in micro team teaching.

Throughout the year a series of assessments were effected by the leadership team for analyzing and remedying problems associated with the operation. Usually these assessments became the basis for the strategies which were used for the development of a series of

inservice meetings.

Beyond the professional alliance between the university staff and the school, there was also financial collaboration. In essence the school district paid the clinical professor's entire salary, and the university provided consultant services and paid for the substitute teachers used in the micro team teaching operation.

Evaluation

The program has not been in operation long enough to be evaluated; however, among the teachers and student teachers involved in the program, there does seem to be an indication of strong support. In the opinion of the developer, the project has the potential for being expanded to other schools and in other directions. It appears to be a more expedient vehicle for the diffusion of educational innovations, and for closing the gap between the teacher training programs in the schools and the colleges of education.

# OPERATION CITE:

# (COOPERATIVE INVESTMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION)

SP 006 397

Burton E. Altman

Professor of Elementary Education

Operation CITE--Cooperative Investment in Teacher Education--precipitated out of an earlier arrangement with the public schools. The parent project for Operation CITE was micro team teaching, which is a plan that provides for two student teachers and one experienced teacher to operate as a team in a self-contained classroom in the elementary school (see Appendix A). At the time micro team teaching was being operationalized, it was conceived that there would emerge from among the experienced teachers involved a staff member who would be identified as a clinical professor serving the university as a field supervisor of student teachers.[1] The legitimizing referent for the clinical professor has been articulately conceptualized by Conant and others at a conference at Northwestern University in 1966.[2] In essence they were saying that the concept of the clinical professor is perceived as the link between the professor who lacks recency in teaching in the schools and the classroom teacher who may be out of touch with newer concepts of curriculum and instruction. However, Operation CITE, as conceived, was to go beyond these operationalizing conceptions generated by the participants at that conference by making a series of provisions to enhance the effectiveness of the clinical professor's role. One such provision was to assign a staff

---

[1]For explanatory purposes a clinical professor is hereby identified as a public school teacher who can facilitate the acquisition of cognitive and affective behavior in the classroom, and whose sensitivity to the needs of student teachers is validated by his lasting association with those with whom he has previously supervised. These professional attributes are further complimented by traits which are characterized by one who is held in high regard by his colleagues in the building and by one who is open to change.

[2]William R. Hazard (ed.), The Clinical Professorship in Teacher Education, (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1967).

member from the department of elementary education to work with the micro teams, particularly with the critic teachers, in planning for instruction; and another was to have the building principal become an active participant in the total operation. It was upon this aspect of describing the fusion of the pre-service and in-service teacher training activities within an individual elementary school that this entry was centered. Specifically, the project attempted to achieve the following objectives:

1. To provide a closer, more open relationship between student teachers and their supervisor.
2. To improve the cooperation between the local elementary school building and teacher training institutions by fusing the human resources of the school with the university.
   a. To enable practitioners in the field to participate in making decisions about the pre-service training activities for student teachers.
   b. To make it possible for college staff members to participate in making decisions about the in-service training activities for teachers in the field.
3. To develop a leadership team consisting of the building principal, clinical professor, and university consultant committed to assisting teachers find solutions to field problems.
   a. To help student teachers and experienced teachers make operational within their classrooms newer types of curriculem, instructional, and organizational models.
   b. To establish a demonstration center within the building where teachers within the region can observe newer teaching practices in classrooms similar to their own.

The position as hammered out with the school superintendent, building principal and university personnel, required that the clinical professor have direct responsibility, as in the past, for an elementary classroom on a half-time basis. The other "half-time" he would serve as a supervisor of student teachers in the bulding providing leadership as a change agent for curriculum and instruction on the building level, and serving as a consultant to the university

in designing pre-service teacher training activities.[3]

In the process of inaugurating the pilot plan at the Hamilton School in La Crosse, Wisconsin, there was a series of building meetings in the spring and summer prior to the 1969 fall term in which the program was scheduled to begin. At these meetings the responsibilities of university consultant, building principal and clinical professor, as well as staff members, were delineated. Each served a different role. The consultant was to bring to the team during their planning sessions newer notions about curriculum and instruction, as well as reinforce existing practices; the building principal was to facilitate administratively the plans made by the teachers at these planning sessions;[4] the clinical professor was to make frequent observations of the teaching done by student teachers; and the critc teachers were to demonstrate and get the student teachers to make operational the concepts and generalizations about the didactics of teaching and teacher behavior specified in the teacher training program.

Throughout the operation a continuous series of assessments were made by the leadership team consisting of the clinical professor, building principal and university consultant. This group at their meetings developed strategies for remedying existing and emerging problems. Frequently these strategies consisted of developing types of

---

[3]Half-time was considered over a one year period, and left to the discretion of the clinical professor. It was never interpreted as teaching mornings in one's own class and supervising in the afternoons; nor was it teaching two and one-half days a week and supervising two and one-half days a week. The greatest amount of supervisory flexibility was identified with the program.

[4]In this operation each critic was to have one morning per week to plan and evaluate instruction with the student teachers in the micro teams.

innovative in-service programs. The structure of these programs was designed to make it convenient for the student teachers and critics to take more variables into account in planning for instruction. For example, the leadership team instituted a plan by which each team member was provided time to spend (in addition to the time allocated for the weekly planning sessions) at least one hour a week during the school day in professional study. For this purpose, materials (i.e., filmstrips on developing behavioral objectives, reprints of articles, sound tapes of recent lectures given in methods courses, etc.) were made available to the staff by the university consultant.[5] Another innovation was to have the teams hold their weekly planning sessions in areas of La Crosse where equipment and materials needed in the planning was available. As a result, planning took place not only in the local building, but also at the university or local public library. In addition to developing in-service programs, other plans related to the explanation of the project to the school community had to be made. The building principal coordinated these operations and held orientation meetings for the parents describing the program to them.[6]

Beyond a professional coalition, there was also a financial cooperative arrangement between the university and school district, without which the program would never have materialized. In essence,

---

[5]A concerted effort was made by the leadership team to change some of the existing conceptions held about teacher behavior. One of these was the notion that the hallmark of a good teacher was measured by the number of hours he spent in the classroom; e.g., "he never leaves his room, even for lunch!"

[6]The identification of the building principal with all aspects of the project became so well integrated that frequently he was cajoled by the staff to become an instructional member of the teams--which he willingly did.

the school district agreed to continue to pay the clinical professor's full salary and provide those benefits due any full time member of the teaching staff (health insurance, social security, etc.). The university agreed to pay a stipend approximating the half-time services of the clinical professor, fixed at $5,000.00 per year. This money was to be placed in a special account earmarked for financing the total program. From this account would be drawn funds to pay for an honorarium given the clinical professor and for substitute teachers hired to replace the teachers during the weekly planning sessions (see Appendix A).[7] The account also provided funds for substitutes for other micro teams in the district. Money not used for the program and left in the account at the end of the school year would be returned to the university. Because there were two student teachers working with the clinical professor in his classroom, there was no need to hire an additional staff member to replace the clinical professor when supervising. This operated much like the Wisconsin intern program, with the exception that the student teachers were not paid. Financially the program was mutually beneficial: the university was able to release one and one-half full time staff members from student teaching supervision at a considerable saving;[8]

---

[7]The clinical professor received $50.00 per semester per student teacher supervised by him in the building. It was anticipated that this would run about $1,200.00 per year. The substitutes' salaries were estimated at $3,500.00 per year.

[8]At Wisconsin State University at La Crosse, a staff member maintains a semester teaching load of twelve hours, and supervision of one student teacher is considered as two-thirds of one teaching hour. Since there were twelve student teachers involved it was the equivalent of a eight hour load each semester. The field service conducted by a university staff member as a member of the leadership team was considered, at the time of this report, as two hours of his teaching load.

the public school benefitted from the program in that they were able to up-grade the quality of instruction without making any financial investment.[9]

The program has not been in operation long enough to be evaluated. To make any attempt to provide hard data at this stage would be premature and violate sound research practices. However, in place of hard data, an attempt has been made to gather some normative data from the observations of those involved (see Appendix B). At this stage there does seem to be unanimous satisfaction with the project among the personnel involved.

In conclusion, if one were to capsulate the aspects of this entry which make it innovative, it would be that a plan has been designed for the simultaneous pre-service and in-service training of teachers in school districts and universities hard pressed for funds. Operation CITE, as described in this paper, will be expanded and has the potential for closing the gap between theory and practice, educational innovation and its diffusion, and the training programs in the colleges of education and the schools. This model can be replicated in any area where the following conditions can be met: (1)a classroom teacher

---

[9]A recent mimeographed publication developed by Cooperative Educational Service Agency #11, the state of Wisconsin department of public instruction field agency, in describing the educational needs of this community stated: "...new programs of improvement have been established with unqualified or substandard personnel. As teacher education institutions must use area schools as field laboratories, it is essential to work with those school districts to improve the quality of instruction. At the present time, limited funds are being used to finance in-service programs. This is confirmed by the study of annual budgets of local school districts."

This project is being carried out in what the literature might consider a grey school in a grey school district. This should be interpreted to mean a district which cannot financially provide elementary teachers with planning time during the school week, where supervisory help is extremely limited, where school budgets are pared down by the city council, and where kids in the poorer parts of town are the more visible victims of this frugality.

with the qualities for being designated as a clinical professor; (2)a building principal who is able to rid himself of administrative hang-ups; (3)a university staff member who is willing to supervise curriculum and instructional planning activities; and (4)a leadership team consisting of a principal, clinical professor, and university staff member sensitive to the readiness levels of individual teachers and student teachers.

# APPENDIX A

## Description of Micro Team Teaching

# MICRO TEAM TEACHING

The general purpose of this study was to develop and implement another approach to orientating, simultaneously, experienced and inexperienced (pre-professional) teachers to the theory and practice of team teaching. Identified as micro team teaching, the plan was a scaled down team teaching operation taking place in a single self-contained classroom with two student teachers and one experienced teacher operating as a teaching team. Instead of 75 children in the team group, only 25 to 35 were involved; instead of three adjoining classrooms, only one room was used; instead of three or more experienced teachers on the team, only one was experienced; instead of reorganizing an entire school, only one classroom was involved.

Although scaled down in physical features and number of children involved, the organization planning operations required the teachers to assume the responsibility for developing a cooperative organization for planning, carrying out, and evaluating and instructional program for a group of pupils. Unlike other team teaching organization in which student teachers become part of an ongoing teaching team operation, this plan enabled pre-professional and certified teachers to develop their own plan for team teaching. In other words, there were no slots for the student teachers to fill in an existing team.

Briefly, the specific objectives of the project were:

1. To provide student teachers in elementary education with a type of pre-professional experience which would be compatible with current trends in classroom organization.

2. To provide a limited number of sophomores with opportunities to engage in another type of pre-student teaching field experience as teacher aides.

3. To provide university personnel with the opportunity to learn more intimately about the dynamics of team teaching while working as part of an elementary school team.

4. To enable practitioners in the field to gain experience with another type of classroom organization under optimum conditions.

5. To assist school administrators in experimenting with a plan for another type of classroom organization without reorganizing a building or major part of a building.

Micro Team Development

The micro team project took its initial step in the late spring of 1967 when two elementary supervisors of student teachers in separate schools were asked if they would be willing to try team teaching within their classrooms. They were willing. A meeting was then arranged with the chief administrators of the local school district and representative members of the college of education. Their support was unanimous. During the summer, letters were sent to a group of student teachers describing the nature of the project and asking them to indicate a willingness to participate. By the time the fall semester began team members had been identified, and hopefully all had read the literature sent to them about team teaching. Through a university research grant the project received additional support (seven hundred eighty dollars).

To anyone looking in on a micro team, it would appear to him that what he was witnessing was that in a self-contained classroom of twenty-five to thirty-five children there were three teachers.

However, as one continued to observe these people operate, one would begin to notice subtle differences from the conventional student teaching program. Probably one observable difference would be that the three teachers frequently helped one another teach. The supervising teacher might be seen assisting rather than directing the other teachers. Large group, small group, and individual instruction could all be observed at some time during the day. The small group instruction would take place not only in reading and arithmetic or in other skill areas, but in science, language arts, and social studies as well. Children were grouped and regrouped, at times according to ability, at other times according to interest, and at times just at random to cut down the size of the instructional group. Large group instruction was used to kick off a new unit, and individual instruction was planned for those individuals who had unique needs or interests.

In one fourth grade, to teach the structural characteristics of rhyming, free verse, and Haiku poetry, the team arranged children in three small groups. Each teacher taught one poetic form and would move, every fifteen minutes, to another corner of the room and instruct another group. To culminate this series of small group instruction, each of the team members selected a poem about trees and read it to the class--one in Haiku, one in free verse, and one in rhyming. The children, in reacting to the presentation, were able not only to distinguish among the different forms of poetry, but also were able to explain in depth their own feelings and how others might feel about their preferences for particular poetic forms.

Obviously this type of instruction required considerable planning. To minimize the involvement of the teams in routine non-teaching responsibilities, secretarial help (university work-study students) was to be provided to type tests, record data, and reproduce materials.

Sophomores enrolled in the introduction course in elementary education were to be utilized as teacher aides to prepare instructional aids, tutor students in learning skills, and grade papers. This was instituted, also, to give the team members an opportunity to direct and supervise non-teaching personnel who, in a field situation, would be part of the team organization, as well as to give the sophomores access to observation in the public schools.

The time requirement for planning for instruction leads us, even more significantly, to the most essential and perhaps the most unique characteristic of team teaching--the team planning sessions. In addition to the daily planning, every Friday morning each team spent the hours from 8:00 A.M. to noon in a planning session. University funds provided the school district with the means to hire substitutes to teach the classes while the teams planned. The same substitutes taught the same classes every Friday morning.

At these planning sessions the major segment of time was spent: (1)Evaluating the past week's instruction (e.g., "What went wrong with Wednesday's science lesson?" What needs to be retaught?"); (2) Making decisions about curriculum objectives for future instruction (e.g., "We've got a unit on power coming up--don't you think we ought to place the emphasis on nuclear energy rather than on wind and water or electrical power? If we do, then we'll need to restructure the curriculum design."); (3)Developing instructional plans for achieving the next week's program (e.g., "How can we creatively teach the addition of mixed numbers? Has anyone previewed the filmstrips on fractions?")

In all of these planning operations a considerable amount of individual study by the teachers was necessary. Generally different members of the team assumed responsibility for quarterbacking particular

units. This meant that in addition to having some current and general knowledge about the subject matter, they had to study in depth in order to provide leadership in the content area for other members of the team. Usually the member of a team whose background and experience best suited him for this particular unit was the ad hoc team leader. Leadership, after the first few weeks, rotated among team members rather than being fixed with the critic teacher.

Consultants from the school district and university attended some of the planning meetings. The school district consultant was particularly helpful in destroying the myth that teachers could not engineer the curriculum to meet the needs of their classes because..."they (the central office) won't let us." University consultants assisted the teams in focusing their attention on the broader aspects of team planning instead of on the minutia.

Prior to the replication of the study the second semester, the teams evaluated the general organization of the project and made recommendations that were embodied in the project when it was replicated during the second semester.

The nature of this project was such that no hard data could be obtained to conclude that this was a superior student teaching experience, or that the project significantly, as measured by a statistical treatment, changed the professional behavior of the critic teachers involved, or that there was a heightened measurable achievement on the part of the participating pupils. A review of published studies on team teaching, and a summarization of correspondence with leading researchers in the nation grappling with this problem indicate that there is no scientifically generalizable evidence to support this organization; however, by the same token there is no evidence to refute it. Therefore, in place of hard evidence, what follows is a

summarization of observations made during the project as they relate to the specific objectives of the study:

1. Yes, the project did provide student teachers in elementary education with a type of field experience which was compatible with current trends in classroom organization. The follow-up of the eight student teachers in the project disclosed the following: six accepted team teaching positions, one of whom was hired as a team leader, and another of whom was awarded an experienced teacher fellowship to begin work on his masters degree while teaching in a team teaching program.

2. Yes, the project did provide sophomores in teacher education with opportunities to engage in another type of pre-student teaching field experience as teacher aids. Over one hundred sophomores were involved in developing visual aids, evaluating written work, tutoring children, and observing in the classroom.

3. Yes, the project provided university personnel with the opportunity to observe intimately the dynamics of team teaching. The unique personalities of the members of the teams affected their procedural operation without interfering with the overall objectives of the project. While one team was highly structured and the other was not, they both achieved similar goals, i.e., meeting the needs of the children, developing creative and stimulating lessons, and possessing greater control of curriculum and instruction. A video tape of the planning operation was developed for undergraduate instructional purposes.

4. Yes, the project enabled the experienced teachers to try out a new form of classroom organization. The rigors of the project enabled the critics to engage in what John W. Gardener identified as self-renewal. They became more adept at using textbooks as

points of departure for instruction; they were able to engage in teaching activities which previously they had no time for; and they had time to study in the content areas. As one teacher put it: "After this experience, I'll never be the same--and I'm glad!"

5. Yes, public schools were able to experiment with team teaching in their buildings without tearing down walls, buying expensive equipment, or involving teachers who were not ready to depart from a traditional set up.

6. Although this last observation was not initially stated as one of the objectives of the project, it was noted that the children involved in the project have shown average growth in skills, but considerably more than average growth in cognitive behavior. Although it is too early to tell, present teachers of pupils who were previously engaged in this project report that these children display considerable accomplishment in their independent study habits and in general learning behavior.

The pilot project has been expanded with the organization of more micro teams. It is interesting to note that the teachers originally involved in the teams have become change agents. Other teachers in the district observing the project have asked to become involved in this program. Although the university is continuing to underwrite the project (in the amount of $144.00 per team per semester--$9.00 for a substitute teacher for each planning meeting), it appears that within the year the school district might begin to assume this financial responsibility toward the project.

As the project unfolds it continues to be enveloped in a host of related activities. This year plans are being made to develop additional training films in team planning, to introduce the notion

of heuristics to the teaching operation, to use video tapes to enable teams to evaluate their planning sessions, to encourage more schools from within the region to send teachers and administrators to observe the planning operations, and to use this as a possible program for training clinical professors who can provide leadership in the development of team teachers. From this first step within the classrooms the notion is being entertained within one of the schools to diffuse the teaming operation to involve two or more classrooms. When this occurs, micro is shed, and team teaching evolves.

# APPENDIX B

## Solicited Reactions from Participants Currently Involved in Operation: CITE

## Explanation of Appendix B

Reasonable limitations of space prevented including each document in its entirety; as a result, excerpts from these documents are presented in this appendix. The original documents are on file with the Department of Elementary Education at Wisconsin State University--La Crosse.

Student Teacher Reactions

"...Many good ideas come out of these planning sessions that never would have been thought of by one teacher..."

"...Another very good point is the help all the teachers can give one another..."

"...Each teacher has time during the day to plan or study..."

"...Working with other people for one goal makes teaching an exciting experience..."

"...I personally am very much in favor of the team situation and hope that it can be started in more schools at more levels so the students can benefit from a pooled knowledge of many teachers..."

"...There is more opportunity to try and experiment with the creative and exciting projects the team members dream up..."

"...Another boost to my teaching experience has been the wonderful people I've worked with while here. Mr. Weaver, our principal, is always willing to talk with the teachers and is more than willing to let them try different projects. Having Miss Roellich in the building is also another high point about teaming. Since she also teaches in the building, she knows the children and the problems we are facing. This will help us when she comes in to observe because we can talk to her and she will know just what we mean..."

"...I think the idea of team teaching is an excellent one. However, if the members do not make a concerted effort to cooperate and discuss issues freely, the the axiom can be applied that: 'Too many cooks spoil the broth.'"

"...I feel that as a result of teaming we are better able to meet the individual differences in our students. We are able to give extra help to those who need it because there are now three teachers to do the job only one had previously done..."

"...This situation is great for presenting more than one view, idea, and opinion on everything from planning a lesson to managing a specific discipline problem..."

"...Planning together presents new ways of approaching each topic. Someone has an idea and it snowballs. By the time the unit is finalized there may be no semblance of the initial burst of insight. The best of everyone's contributions is combined to form the best presentation for the youngsters..."

"...What better way to teach cooperation to a group of children than to have them view it in action in the classroom..."

"...The teachers can now plan more thoroughly and each team member can specialize in certain academic areas and lead the team in this area..."

"...The planning session, which is set aside for once a week is not limited to only then. We are planning continuously. During recess or gym we are discussing a particular problem or a new innovation..."

"...There are more people involved who can constructively criticize us..."

"...allows the individual teacher more time to develop more useful and exciting units and do more research in different fields of study..."

"...really helps me in my future teaching, since I am working with five other teachers with five other sets of ideals and ideas toward teaching..."

"...The planning sessions allow each teacher the opportunity just to think. This thinking of new ideas is the most important advantage..."

Critic Teacher Reactions

"...I'm feeling freer around the college students. It's probably due to the fact that we were to call each other by our first names and be on the same level..."

"...Our principal has been most cooperative."

"...Having three teachers sharing their ideas does make for more interesting classes--for the students as well as the teachers..."

"...It's good to be able to share the joy and discouragements of the other two teachers who are teaching these same children..."

"...I find that the two college student team teachers bring in many new and creative ideas from their teacher training courses and can add good ideas during our planning sessions..."

"...At times when one teacher has the entire class, the other teachers can use the time to read and get more information on a subject which they are going to present or teach to a class..."

"...I feel that the children benefit in receiving more individual help, more varied and enriching experiences, and from the pooled knowledge and skills of three teachers rather than one teacher"

"...I benefit in keeping abreast of modern teaching techniques, time for planning and the knowledge that all the children in my room are getting help where and when they need it..."

"...We have been doing this team teaching in schools not built or designed for such a method of teaching. Many people feel this hampers the whole project. This is not so--for we have set up a

schedule as to when we need space, and space is available; whether it be the music room, the reference room or tables set up at the end of the hall. Our principal has been cooperative in finding the space for us..."

"...Our principal has made it possible to spend one hour a week during the school day for our own study time..."

"...We profit so much from each other and therefore the children profit. And they know it and they love it. Each day is an exciting challenge to them. So we end up with more excited teachers and more excited students. What could be better?..."

Clinical Professor's Views

"The following six advantages are listed for Operation CITE:

1. Spot and solve problems more quickly for both the critic teachers and the student teachers.

2. Having had many of the children myself leads me to understand the problem the student teacher will face with this child or that child. (I'm not that far removed from the situation as a college professor would be in stepping into the same situation.)

3. Closer working relationship between principal and university consultant to arrange for group meetings and discussions.

4. Critic teachers are more relaxed when I walk in to supervise.

5. Enriching experience for myself to see the exciting lessons that are being taught to the children and the responses of the children.

6. Able to find areas where the student teachers need a better background from the college--feedback to the college to provide for this; also college can feed back to us new innovations.

(At the end of this school year, I'm quite sure my viewpoints will be enlarged.)"